

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO '522, claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO '522, and claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO '522 in view of Niwa et al. In view of the positions taken by the Examiner, claim 14 has been amended to more clearly bring out an inventive feature of the invention, claims 15 and 17-19 have been correspondingly amended, and claims 22-35 have been added.

Specifically, claim 14 now recites

A method for machining a scroll wrap, comprising:

forming a stationary scroll having an end plate and a scroll wrap extending from said end plate thereof, said scroll wrap of said stationary scroll having a side face,

forming a slewing scroll having an end plate and a scroll wrap extending from said end plate thereof, said scroll wrap of said slewing scroll having a side face,

wherein said side face of said stationary scroll wrap and said side face of said slewing scroll wrap are configured to slide with respect to each other in use; and

Hale-machining said side face of one of said stationary scroll wrap and said slewing scroll wrap by moving along a longitudinal direction of said one of said stationary scroll wrap and said slewing scroll wrap a non-rotational blade **such that machined at one time is a portion of said side face**, of said one of said stationary scroll wrap and said slewing scroll wrap, **extending substantially for a height of said one of said stationary scroll wrap and said slewing scroll wrap**.

Contrary to what is now recited in claim 14, the machining of WO '522 is not performed such that a portion of a side face extending substantially for a height of the stationary scroll wrap or slewing scroll wrap is machined at one time. In this regard, the cutting of WO '522 makes narrow string shavings by cutting only a part of the side face at one time, and this cutting is

repeated many times to obtain a final shape of the side face. Specifically, in WO '522 it is stated that, "a strip of material is removed from the wrap...", which indicates that the cutting of WO '522 is performed by a narrow blade and removes material little by little, similar to lathe work. Although this kind of cutting leaves a scar similar as with the instant invention, a roughness of the surface after being cut is very coarse as compared with the instant invention. Additionally, since the lathe-like cutting procedure of WO '522 is repeated many times, over-heating and deterioration of the material could result.

On the other hand, the Hale-machining of the instant invention cuts the material with a broad blade in a manner analogous to planing a board, whereby the lathe-like cutting of WO '522 is avoided. Accordingly, with the Hale-machining of the instant invention, because the broad blade employed is very smooth, and because smoothness of the blade determines roughness, a very smooth side face of the wrap can be readily attained.

Thus, because WO '522 does not at one time machine a portion of the side face extending substantially for the height of the wrap, claim 14 is not anticipated by this reference.

Additionally, claim 28 is believed to be patentable in its own right because this claim requires that the Hale-machining results in *an entirety of the side face of the wrap being machined in one pass of the blade*. Because only a single pass of the blade is required to obtain a machined surface, unlike the multiple passes associated with the lathe-like cutting of WO '522, there is no over-heating of the material and thus no danger of deterioration of the material.

Niwa et al. does not remedy these deficiencies of WO '522, whereby claims 14-35 are allowable over these references either taken alone or in combination.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideaki MATSUHASHI

By:


Joseph M. Gorski

Registration No. 46,500
Attorney for Applicant

JMG/nka
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 26, 2007